

Appln No. 09/692,747

Amdt date February 15, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 15, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of this application. Concurrently herewith, Applicants have filed a Request for Continued Examination of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the most recent Office action, and reexamine and consider the present application.

Prior to turning to the substance of the Office action, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner also consider the Information Disclosure Statements dated March 28, 2001, May 2, 2001, March 8, 2002, and August 6, 2003. For convenience, Applicants are submitting copies of the same herewith. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited references and return the associated Forms 1449 with the next communication.

Claims 1-45 are pending. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 11, 13-16, 25-29, 37 and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Brookner, U.S. Patent 6,041,317. The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudia, U.S. Patent 6,009,177.

In their Amendment filed July 30, 2004, Applicants amended independent claim 1 to include the following limitation: "a re-registration wizard for requiring the user to re-register if a second computer used by the user to access the system is not the same as the first computer used for registering the user." A similar limitation was either set forth or intended to be set forth in independent claims 16, 29 and 37. The Examiner, in

Appln No. 09/692,747

Amdt date February 15, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 15, 2004

maintaining his rejections, reasoned that the claim language lends itself to a reading that the same physical computer may somehow take two different states and satisfy the limitation of first and second computers set forth in the claims despite the cited limitation. See October 15, 2004 Office action, pp. 2 and 3. As such, the Examiner submits that the Brookner and Sudia references anticipate or would have rendered obvious the noted claims.

In response to the Examiner's comments, Applicants have now amended independent claims 1, 16, 29 and 37 to include the limitation that the first and second computers specified in the claim are not the same physical computer. As Brookner and Sudia fail to disclose or suggest a system including "a re-registration wizard for requiring the user to re-register if a second computer used by the user to access the system is not the same physical computer as the first computer used for registering the user," Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request allowance of pending claims 1-45 and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Art Hasan

Reg. No. 41,057

626/795-9900

SAH/amb